Case 1:15-cr-00100-GHW Document 127 Filed 07/11/16 Page 1 of 47 1

G66HMCCS 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 100 (GHW) V . 5 SEAN McCABE, 6 Sentence 7 Defendant. 8 9 New York, N.Y. June 6, 2016 10 2:40 p.m. 11 Before: 12 HON. GREGORY H. WOODS, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA 16 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 17 EMIL BOVE Assistant United States Attorney 18 ROBERT S. GERSHMAN 19 Attorney for Defendant 20 21 22 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ BOVE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Emil Bove for the government.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon.

MR. GERSHMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Robert Gershman on behalf of Mr. McCabe, who is present next to me.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Good afternoon, Mr. McCabe.

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: We're here to conduct a sentencing hearing for Mr. McCabe. I've received and reviewed the following materials in connection with the sentencing: A presentence report dated May 13, 2016; the defendant's sentencing memorandum, which is dated May 19, 2016, together with its exhibits; the government's sentencing memorandum, which is dated May 27, together with its exhibits. Just before I took the bench, I was also handed a letter to me dated today from Mr. McCabe. I just read this letter. It is not posted to ECF.

Mr. Bove, have you received this letter?

MR. BOVE: I just received it as well, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask, then, have each of the parties received all of the materials that I've just described?

MR. BOVE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. GERSHMAN: Defense has, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you. Have the two sentencing

1	memoranda been filed with the clerk of court?
2	MR. BOVE: The government's has, your Honor.
3	MR. GERSHMAN: Defense as well.
4	THE COURT: Are there any other submissions in
5	connection with the sentencing?
6	MR. BOVE: Not from the government.
7	MR. GERSHMAN: I would just ask maybe till tomorrow
8	after I leave to upload the letter that your Honor received
9	today.
10	THE COURT: Thank you. I will take care of that.
11	MR. GERSHMAN: Thank you, Judge.
12	THE COURT: Thank you.
13	Mr. Gershman, have you read the presentence report?
14	MR. GERSHMAN: I have, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your client?
16	MR. GERSHMAN: I have your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Mr. McCabe, have you read the presentence
18	report?
19	THE DEFENDANT: I have your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Thank you. Have you discussed it with
21	your counsel?
22	THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Have you had the opportunity to review
24	with your counsel any errors in the presentence report or any
25	other issues that should be addressed by the Court?

Do you have any objections related to the factual accuracy of the presentence report?

MR. GERSHMAN: No, your Honor.

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

Given that there are no objections to the factual recitations in the presentence report, the Court adopts the factual recitations in the presentence report. The presentence report will be made a part of the record in this matter and will be placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to the Court.

Now, the district courts are no longer required to follow the sentencing guidelines. We are still required to consider the applicable guidelines in imposing sentence. And to do so, it is necessary that we accurately calculate the sentencing range. In this case, the defendant pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to conspiracy to commit money laundering in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1956(h). There is a plea agreement in this case in which the parties stipulated to a particular calculation of the sentencing guidelines.

Counsel, can I confirm that I'm correct that the calculation in the presentence report is consistent with that agreement with the exception of the sophisticated laundering enhancement?

MR. BOVE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. GERSHMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Bove, does the government agree that a two-level

1 adjustment is appropriate here under Section 3E1.1(a).

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Is the government moving for an additional one-level adjustment under Section 3E1.1(b)?

MR. BOVE: I am.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I calculate the sentencing guidelines in a manner consistent with the presentence report. I find that the government has failed to meet its burden to demonstrate that the sophisticated money laundering enhancement in this case applies in the case of Mr. McCabe. The applicable sentencing guidelines manual is the November 1, 2015, sentencing guidelines manual. The base offense level is determined pursuant to Section 2S1.1.

Pursuant to Section 2S1.1(a)(2), the base offense level is eight plus the number of offense levels from the table in Section 2B1.1 corresponding to the value of the laundered funds. Since the value of the laundered funds is \$200,000, ten levels are added for a base offense level of 18. Because the defendant knew or believed that the laundered funds were the proceeds of a drug trafficking transaction, six offense levels are added pursuant to Section 2S1.1(b)(1). Because the defendant was convicted under 18 U.S.C. Section 1956, an additional two offense levels are added. So the base offense level to this point sums to 26.

agreement contains a stipulated enhancement for sophisticated laundering under Section 2S1.1(b)(2)(B). However, I have my own independent obligation to evaluate the applicable sentencing guidelines range in this matter, and I conclude that, based on the facts before me, the government has not met its burden to demonstrate that the sophisticated laundering section under 2S1.1(b)(2)(B) applies to Mr. McCabe on this record. Because the defendant has a demonstrated acceptance of responsibility for his offense through his plea allocution, I apply a two-level reduction pursuant to Section 3E1.1(a). Upon motion by the government, an additional one-level reduction is warranted under Section 3E1.1(b). As a result, the applicable guidelines offense level is 23.

The defendant has one criminal history point resulting from one prior conviction on January 22, 2013. The defendant was sentenced to six months' probation on each of two counts of harassing phone calls with each such term to run consecutively, yielding one criminal history point. In sum, I find that the offense level is 23 and the Criminal History Category is I. Therefore, the guidelines range in this matter is 46 to 57 months' imprisonment.

Does either party have any objections to the sentencing quidelines calculation?

MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Thank you.
2	MR. GERSHMAN: No, sir.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	Mr. Gershman, do you wish to be heard with respect to
5	sentencing?
6	MR. GERSHMAN: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: Thank you.
8	MR. GERSHMAN: Would it be appropriate if the
9	defendant could be called as a witness at this time?
10	THE COURT: I will allow you to proceed however you
11	wish. I will allow Mr. McCabe to make a statement. Would you
12	like to make a statement before he makes his statement or would
13	you like to have Mr. McCabe alone make a statement? I am very
14	much in your hands as to how you'd best like to proceed. In
15	either event, I do not expect for you to call Mr. McCabe as a
16	witness; rather, I'll accept his statement.
17	MR. GERSHMAN: Okay.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	Mr. Bove, did you want to add something?
20	MR. BOVE: I apologize, your Honor. I was just
21	suggesting to defense counsel that we might confer for a second
22	about how best to proceed.
23	THE COURT: Please do.
24	MR. BOVE: Thank you.
25	(Discussion held off the record)

MR. GERSHMAN: May the defendant remain seated for his statement, Judge?

THE COURT: First let me ask you, do you wish to make a statement on behalf of Mr. McCabe, Mr. Gershman?

MR. GERSHMAN: I would, if possible, defer till after he makes his statement, Judge.

THE COURT: I'd be happy to proceed in that way.

Mr. McCabe, do you wish to make a statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Proceed. Please rise.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I'm aware that you've read the letter that I presented today, and I'm aware of how some of the things that were in the reports submitted by the government made me look. I'm aware that everybody tries to sell their point, and I've made every effort to be as honest as possible and as forthcoming as possible with everybody up to this point. I was anticipating being on the stand and being questioned by both sides, so please excuse my lack of preparation.

The circumstances which led up to everything that happened were very unusual and very, very intense, and things that have happened since equally so. But I cannot overstate the amount of regret that I have for what I have done and for the things that I said, and I'm aware that I said a lot of things that look really harmful. However, I ask that your Honor consider that at the time I would have admitted to being

the second man on the grassy knoll if I thought it would have helped matters, if I thought it would have helped to protect the people I was in business with. By "business," I'm talking about the legitimate mining business in Colombia, or I believed it to be.

I've let a lot of people down, and I hope to be able to reconcile sooner rather than later. I have an aging mother that I would very much like to see. I have, for lack of a better term, a second family that I feel a great sense of responsibility for. And if you would grant me the opportunity, I promise you I will not let you down. That's all I have.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McCabe.

Mr. Gershman.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks, Judge. Would it be all right if I proffer a few things before I get into an argument, Judge?

THE COURT: Proceed.

MR. GERSHMAN: First about some things that are not in my submission, one is a letter from the defendant's mother.

It's talked to in the PSR that his ma is a judge in

San Francisco, California. There's some statements that the officer had with his ma; and, ethically, she did not feel it appropriate to write a letter as a judge to your Honor, in a sense did not want to play the judge card to any extent in this matter.

They have a close relationship. It talks about, in

the PSR, the family dynamics that happened early, the love that she still has for Mr. McCabe. In the past few years, she came down to Florida to make sure that the businesses he were in were legitimate. They did keep a close relationship, but we would ask that you not take negative that there's no letter there. The letter is not there because of her status and any negative thought that this Court would have that if she wrote a letter as a judge in this matter, it was maybe a little pushy and inappropriate. So she left her comments to the PSR and to my proffer to you.

She, of course, loves Mr. McCabe and, like many family members that come before you, would want him to be released as soon as possible. The PSR talks about her then-husband, Mr. McCabe's father, dying early, the effect it had on Mr. McCabe — and this was in the 1970s in San Francisco — and the result and effect upon Mr. McCabe in going to, what we refer to, as reform school, needing help for dual-diagnosis issues. He did, in fact, get that help and for a number of years has been clean. So to that extent, the family is grateful for Mr. McCabe's staying clean.

Present today in the courtroom in the second row is -the gentleman is a person that helped me. The Court order
allowed him access to the MCC for mitigation investigation
purposes.

Next to him is a woman named Molly Rainey. She was,

at the time of defendant's arrest in 2014, the defendant's then-fiancee. The crime happened, as the Court knows, in June, beginning of June, June 6, I believe. Mr. McCabe is in Panama handing the 160 to the undercover, and there was a waiting period because codefendant Fares had not come into the country. I believe the government wanted to wait till December 2. Codefendant arrived; contemporaneous arrests. During that time, they were fiancee -- Mr. Rainey was his fiancee. Her maiden name was Ms. Raff.

My point is this: They've known each other for roughly a decade. Jim Raff, Molly's father, Mr. McCabe's father figure, have been friends and are solid friends. There came an issue, while Mr. McCabe was housed at MCC, that Molly Raff got married and is now Molly Rainey. And because of the, I think, two-tiered love and affection the family had for Mr. McCabe, they were afraid to tell him, afraid to tell him on an emotional, spiritual level and the effect it would have on him while he was alone at MCC.

I kept in constant contact with him. They knew why I was coming on Friday and was visiting Mr. McCabe. After I dropped my bags at the hotel, I got to -- he's in Brooklyn. So I got to the main detention center about 1:00-ish. When I saw Mr. McCabe, by 1:00 o'clock both Mr. Raff and Ms. Rainey had advised him on this past Friday that she got married. I would proffer that, although they were -- Molly would say that she's

still in love with him. Mr. Raff would say that -- he still is his significant father figure in life -- they were afraid to tell him over the past year because of the negative mental effect it would have upon him pre-sentencing or afterwards, but they wanted to tell him, although last minute, before I told him that day on Friday.

Ms. Rainey would further tell the Court that during their relationship, Mr. McCabe would do anything for her. If she needed help with anything, if she had trouble with a car or trouble with any issues, her phone call would be to Mr. McCabe, and Mr. McCabe was personally there to help her. Ms. Rainey is 26 years old, has a bachelor of science, is a fifth grade teacher in a town called Bradenton, which is in Florida. She would say positive things about Mr. McCabe's character as a human being. She still loves him. Obviously, she's married to someone else, but that love has not dwindled or left. She has moved on. That would be my proffer, if the Court would please accept, from Ms. Rainey, Judge. As well, I meant to say on the record that that was my proffer from Judge Lucy McCabe if the Court would accept as well.

May I just go on to some other comments, Judge?
THE COURT: Proceed.

MR. GERSHMAN: All right. I have this date of incident happening on June 6, 2014, where Mr. McCabe does not declare on the form of having greater than \$10,000, going to

Panama and handing 160,000 to the undercover. So there's \$40,000 withheld. I don't think there's a factual issue that Mr. McCabe kept \$13,000 and has no personal knowledge as to the exact division amongst the two codefendants or others as to the disposition of the remaining \$27,000. But Mr. McCabe took 13. I think at first maybe he was promised more, but for whatever reason, he took an even \$13,000.

This is a 20-year BOP max with a three-year supervised release. I would agree with the PSR that he cannot afford a fine. His financials are self-explanatory. He has no money. And as Mr. McCabe briefly advised the Court, this crime was done because of the need for money. Mr. McCabe had put money into that legitimate gold mine as well as Mr. Raff put approximately -- and this is just approximations -- 140,000 of his family money in. That was a retirement account his wife had of 40 and another approximate 90 or some of Mr. Raff's own money.

I've provided the Court as exhibits to the defense memorandum some documents that I think substantially prove that the gold mine was a legitimate business. I gave the Court a total of exhibits A through I. And I am, just for purposes of this portion of the conversation, directing the Court's attention to those exhibits that are germane to the Colombian mine. The exhibits are listed on the bottom of page 24.

Starting with letter C, there's roughly 20 photographs

of Mr. McCabe, Mr. Raff, some of the workers at the mine. The last few pages are of a certain excavator that ended up not working. Money had to be spent to try and get that excavator up, and it was all — never put into the excavator and that mine never generated income.

But afterwards, in letters D, E, F, and G are various exhibits that show money being sent, MoneyGram. The attorneys -- I would call them incorporation or corporation Colombian papers for officially opening the business of that gold mine. There's further government documents showing that that attorney went through lawful resources and avenues to open up that gold mine. I gave the Court just two pages of a checkbook. I have the whole checkbook, but I just gave the Court two pages, the front page and then the first entry, and then communications and the like between the Colombian attorney that was used for this project, the government, and the investors which were, in this case, Mr. McCabe and Mr. Raff.

Two other exhibits that I included, before getting to his inmate work in a second, letter B is a Miami Police Department brothers badge. And that is his cooperation, just as a friend of the Miami Beach Police Department officer, helping in working with the agency to shut down two illegal type businesses that Mr. McCabe previously worked, entertainment businesses that Mr. McCabe had knowledge of regarding ordinances, distances, and those things. His friend,

a Miami Dade officer, asked him for help. As a result of certain violence and negative criminal things that were happening, he gave that help just talking. There was no open case or cooperation. It was just help. As a result, the officer gave Mr. McCabe what's referred to as a Miami Police Department brothers badge. I have that. I put two pictures in the exhibit that shows the gentlemen's name, Mr. Freed, the officer, as well as the commemorative badge that's on the other side of the wallet.

There are two letters on behalf of Mr. McCabe that I would ask the Court to accept. In them, I think what is most important is what Mr. McCabe has done since he was in MCC, which is listed as letter A. It is now referred to at MCC as the McCabe Program. It had never happened before. It has now been left to others that he has taught how to do it.

But in general, Judge, the first couple of pages of Exhibit A were written December 18, 2015, wherein number 10, this positive decision report, which are very rare -- I'm not sure if the Court has ever seen one, but this is out of the U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Prisons, positive decision report -- front page letter A, talking about Mr. McCabe, his register number, times. And as you go down to number 10, it states: "Inmate McCabe has provided his expertise and service as a volunteer to the education department and to the inmates of this unit, as well as the

general population of the institution, has made himself available to instruct classes in English as a second language, GED and adult continuing education programs, especially with regard to career development skills.

"Mr. McCabe has given his time not only during the daily operational hours of the educational department but his own time conducting classes for his fellow inmates on the unit. I can personally attest to the quality of Mr. McCabe's efforts through my own observations and evaluations as his immediate supervisor and by the large number of inmates who participate in the program he provides."

The second page goes down different categories:

- A. Quality of work: Outstanding. Does superior work.
- B. Quality of work: Outstanding. Drives self exceptionally hard at all times.

Initiative: Outstanding. Has good ideas on better ways to do things.

- D. Eagerness to learn: Outstanding. Eager to master job; wants to know everything there is to know about it.
- E. Ability to learn: Outstanding. Very quick to learn. Excellent memory.
- F. Need for supervision dependability, safety, care of equipment: Needs little supervision. Good record of dependability has promptness.

- G. Response to supervision: Outstanding. Makes a real effort to please the instructor.
- H. Ability to work with others: Outstanding. Gets along well with everyone. Very popular.

Overall job performance: Promote the person to a more demanding job at a higher pay rate.

Then there's a sort of handwritten two-line narrative on the bottom: "For the reasons mentioned" -- I think that says. I can't read that word too well, Judge -- "mentioned above, Mr. McCabe is being recommended for a higher grade level of work."

The next page is what he created as a school for the inmates at MCC. It's written as a calendar, and it's printed. It doesn't print necessarily the exact colors that it originally was but goes through language arts, math and English, social studies, ESL, ESL II, math and Spanish; and it has the dates, the times, the whole thing.

The next page is a handwritten one that he started almost as a draft. And then afterwards are the certificates that he has earned while he's in MCC, which is Mandarin Chinese, education tutor, reflections, tutor training, Toastmasters International, unit literacy tutor, ESL as a second language. It goes on. It has his tutor agreement which has some numbers, test grade 100, signed off upon his arrival. It thereafter has almost like transcripts. The first two pages

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are transcripts from the institution at MCC, and then the last two pages are his grades that are referred to in a separate section from when he was a child. I put those last sheets together with that.

So Mr. McCabe worked at least for, if we're averaging, 35 hours a week in that division. He worked there for 70-plus weeks at MCC. He's only been in Brooklyn now about two weeks. Again, on average, just by the multiplication, I come up with approximately 2,400-plus hours of work that he has helped with the inmates. Through his help, approximately 350 inmates have There are another 100-plus that are in the passed their GED. testing phase to see where they place to go for that GED. That's the time that he was taken from MCC, just ballparking it, three weeks ago to Brooklyn. He kept everything there for the next person that he taught because, obviously, the end was going to come one way or another, transfer or sentence. there's catalogs, there's materials, cupboards, and he has trained others to carry on. He also helped others in less formal settings because they knew the work he did. They would come to him and ask him for help in any of the different languages or any of the different topics.

To that extent, Judge, in my memorandum, when I discussed this topic in the section asking for variance, I titled that on page 8 "Defendant's Truly Unprecedented Accomplishments During his Pretrial Detention in MCC." I

think, although I'm not supposed to say I, defense thinks that those accomplishments are unique to anyone the Court has seen in the past or will see in the future. You will always have the defendants that will express remorse or be contrite or talk about things that they have done positive on the outside before arrest, but in these 18 months, Mr. McCabe on his own, without Court order, voluntarily has helped, in my opinion, greater than he did even while on the outside. And I think that says something about the person, at least about the person trying to get better, trying to help others, trying to do anything that is positive because at some point of the assimilation into society in the release, whenever the Court deems release is appropriate. He's done great with that, and that stands out above and beyond love and support of family.

He's in there alone. As the Court knows, all he has is CorrLinks and a couple hundred minutes on the phone a month, and he took it upon himself and has maintained it. Even when he got to Brooklyn, day of going to Brooklyn, he filled out the form: Let me do it here. Never got a response, maybe because it was too short of a time from this transfer until the sentencing. So I would ask the Court to consider his work at MCC when constructing a sentence.

On the first page of my memorandum, I just sort of did a conclusory sort of couple paragraphs where I asked for 23 months followed by three years. Part of that thought was the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

following: Mr. Cristo-Fares, if I'm pronouncing that right, the Court did not give pretrial supervision because of removal or deportation proceedings, which is usually sort of useless. They come in and have their 24 hours to report. So the Court gave him the high end of the guidelines, 57, I think.

The structure that I propose, 23, which is half of bottom, plus maximum three-year pretrial would have Mr. McCabe still supervised in combination by the government for a greater amount of time than Mr. Cristo-Fares. Only for a couple of months, but still for a greater amount of time.

That gives, from our position, under the factors and the findings the Court makes, a reasonable sentence, not greater than -- the basic language that the Court will say before imposing whatever the Court imposes upon Mr. McCabe. And we think, from a criminal point of view, he has obviously accepted responsibility. He did the crime. I made an argument on the bond appeal to your Honor which I included in my motion, which I'll refer to as puffery or the argument that the government makes that -- in sort of return to my argument that from June when the crime happened until December when codefendant came back into the country, Mr. McCabe remained crime free, the government made a comment, I think, in their sentencing memo to the effect that, well, that wasn't because -- I'm just paraphrasing, Mr. Bove -- paraphrasing that it wasn't because of not wanting to, because there are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recordings, admittedly, where Mr. McCabe is on the phone — what I would call the puffery because Mr. McCabe never had the ability, the financial ability, the plane ability, the boat ability, or the resources necessary to do any of the things that were discussed on the phone. I'm not minimizing. The discussion should not have happened. It should have been a divorce from the situation once money was delivered. But I would ask the Court to consider that.

Another area I would ask the Court to consider was Mr. McCabe was arrested in or around the home where the Raffs are, and that is in the Sarasota, Florida, area. At the time, Mr. McCabe had, besides a valid Colombia work visa, he had a valid Florida carry concealed weapons permit. In Mr. McCabe's car at the Raff's home, where he's not arrested -- he's arrested some yards away. I believe 100. I could be off on that, but it was a distance away -- in the glove compartment of that car is a gun. Mr. McCabe kept the gun in the glove box because -- trying to follow the CCW rules, unloaded that gun, and put the magazines in his pocket. There is a picture in the government's sentencing memorandum that has a picture of the gun which looks like one live round, a magazine outside the gun, and the gun. You can't tell if it's in the glove box or not, but it's for sure a picture of it at the beginning of their sentencing memorandum.

When I confront Mr. McCabe with it, he for sure

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

maintains that the gun is unloaded, because he didn't want the Raffs to get in trouble. It's at their home. And the ammunition is put in his pockets. There is some discussion in the paperwork about finding a magazine in Mr. McCabe's pocket. The government might make an argument that there were actually two magazines, one from his pocket, one from the photo. I would proffer that Mr. McCabe would say there were two magazines, but both are in his pocket. The gun was left unloaded.

Procedurally, Judge, once arrested, as stated in the paperwork, he was cooperative with law enforcement to the extent that they asked him questions and he answered them, incriminating himself. He was taken to the West Palm Beach division of Florida before he was removed here. I was provided discovery in a timely manner, discussed it with the government, and unlike the -- well, not disparaging anyone, I would ask the Court to differentiate the issues with attorneys and discovery as to the other defendant or defendants and realize that everything was done, I thought, smoothly with the government. Discovery provided. I announced in Court when you had a scheduling hearing both defendants were ready for a change of plea. Change of plea happened. There were a couple of continuances. I know I had a personal college thing with my daughter once that caused a continuance, but otherwise, there was no need for the government to spend their resources and

otherwise extend themselves any further than was necessary in this case.

If I could just review my notes for a second, please, Judge?

THE COURT: Please take your time.

MR. GERSHMAN: So there's one other topic, Judge, that I would like to bring up. I'm not sure it carries any weight or thought with you. But this weekend when I was here and doing some research, I found a case out of the United States District Court Eastern District of New York that was filed in the Brooklyn clerk's office on May 25, 2016. I printed it out at the hotel. I did not upload it, but it is written by Senior United States District Court Judge Frederic Block. And I have at least enough copies for your Honor and the government.

But if the Court would consider that this opinion discusses what he refers to as, outside of any sentence that the Court gives, the collateral effects upon a convicted defendant on the outside of society which some in the system would call civil death. I don't need to go down the list for your Honor, but your Honor knows that when a defendant is a convicted felon, it talks about -- or His Honor talks about the effects that the federal government's benefits, for example, have upon a convicted defendant. Federal law alone, a felony conviction will render an individual ineligible for public housing; Section 8 vouchers; Social Security Act benefits;

supplemental nutrition benefits; student loans; Hope
Scholarship; Legal Services Corp., public housing eviction
proceedings; disqualify individuals from holding various
positions; and, of course, the "check the box" on the private
employer. And as the Court knows, President Obama has
initiated by executive order trying to get rid of that "check
the box" until the end of the employment process so those
capable of fulfilling a job who are convicted felons are not
checking that box initially, and that's something that I know
from the top is trying to occur.

Every state disenfranchises convicted felons to some extent. I think there's a couple exceptions of Maine and Vermont. And in this case, this was a drug trafficking case where a woman was charged with importing cocaine, I think it was 600-plus grams, and possession of cocaine and that this judge on a 20, plus or minus, month guideline sentenced her to one year.

There's some other quotes that if I just may take up the Court's time on that for a second, Judge. 20 U.S.C. 1091, defendant is a college student. Held internship as a child. Will be ineligible for grants, loans, work assistance for a period and duration of her college career. There's, of course, the denied admission to federally assisted housing for a reasonable time; not eligible for assistance under any state program as part of Title IV of the Social Security Act. She

cannot be issued a passport during her term of supervision.

And then it goes into some of the licensing areas of childcare,
pharmaceutical, transportation, hospice, and those areas that
need licensing.

So to the extent that the Court would consider the collateral effects that this sentence would have on Mr. McCabe upon his exit from BOP, whenever the Court deems that to be fair and reasonable, we would ask the Court to consider that theory. We think that the 23 months followed by three years effectuates the need to confine and supervise Mr. McCabe for the reasons expressed, Judge. If the Court has any questions, I apologize I ran on a little bit, but that will be our presentation please, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Bove, does the government wish to be heard with respect to sentencing?

MR. BOVE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

With respect to that last point, your Honor, about the collateral consequences of conviction, I'm not sure about the criminal history of the defendant at issue in a case that defense counsel was just describing, but this is not the defendant's first conviction, while although it is actually his first federal conviction. Prior convictions were not enough and the lateral consequences of those convictions were not enough to incentivize this defendant to refrain from further

federal conduct.

I know this is the second sentence in this case. Your Honor's read the submissions, and so you're familiar with the conduct itself, having already found that it was indeed serious. This is the type of behavior that facilitates and allows drug traffickers on an international level to engage in these activities. It allows them to do so lucratively and to their financial benefit.

There's just two points I want to make in response to the counsel's comments about the conduct. There's a little bit of a back and forth in the submissions about the reason for the gap in time between the delivery of the purported drug proceeds in Panama and the defendant's arrest. We've cited in our submission to these communications between the defendant and one of the confidential sources in August and September of 2014. The government's position is that those reflect not puffery, your Honor, but his intent, the defendant's intention that if presented with further opportunities to engage in additional or enhanced criminal conduct, that that was what the defendant wanted to do in late summer and early fall of 2014.

Counsel also has made some comments today about the firearm that was seized incident to the defendant's arrest and the reason for its presence and the status of the gun at the time it was seized. The principal aggravating consideration there, your Honor, arises from the defendant's post-arrest

statement. The gun was there for the purpose security. In his words: In case something — just in case something happened. That firearm was brought to an intended meeting, or the vicinity of an intended meeting, with someone the defendant understood to be an international drug trafficker. It drastically increased the likelihood of danger to others that arises from this offense, and it's another feature of this conduct that is aggravating beyond some of the characteristics with respect to the other defendants.

All that said, your Honor, I think the one thing that makes this a complex sentencing is that there is a significant tension between the defendant's history and his offense conduct and, frankly, his statements today and his presentation. I don't think I would be doing my duty to the Court to not acknowledge that some of the things that the defendant and counsel has brought to the Court's attention about the time since his incarceration are mitigating. And on their face, objectively, it's very hard to dispute that, and I'm not disputing that.

There is, though, a question here of intent, of who Mr. McCabe really is. And I don't think this is a proceeding where that's going to get resolved or it needs to get resolved except insofar as it bears on his risk of recidivism, and the risk here that this is a defendant who as an individual needs to be further deterred beyond the general deterrence points

that I've made at this and other sentencings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In response, I think that that general concept, one of the things that Mr. McCabe said today was when I was speaking to the confidential source and when I was talking during the offense conduct, I was willing to say whatever was necessary to try and make this go forward. I was in dire straits, and I was desperate. Your Honor, I submit that those incentives are even That the defendant is in a position where he heavier today. needs to tell the Court, he needs to be able to tell your Honor, that he is a changed man and that he is rehabilitated. That argument is called into question by the CFTC-related conduct that is outlined in my sentencing submission. I spoke with counsel before this proceeding, and I think he's going to want to address that when I sit down, and I understand that there's some dispute about whether Mr. McCabe actually knew that that order had been entered by the CFTC. I, frankly, find that puzzling, your Honor if there's a public announcement by federal regulatory body in the vicinity of someone's residence, where they're making their livelihood, that that would not in some way or another, whether to counsel or friends who just read the news and the Internet, be brought to the defendant's attention. I find it hard to believe that that's not the case.

But what's more troubling, your Honor, with respect to this question of to what extent should the defendant be credited in claiming to have been rehabilitated today before

the Court, is the conduct itself, because it involves actually victimizing people in what appears, on the face of the CFTC's findings, a fraudulent way. That's not the only time the defendant's engaged in conduct sounding in fraud. His conviction in 1989 also related to insurance fraud. So there's some history, your Honor, here of a man who's willing to say what needs to be said to achieve his own purposes.

Again, this is a factual question that I think is very difficult to resolve in a proceeding like this. I submit that there's a significant risk here that this is a defendant who will recidivate because there's a prolonged course of conduct between the CFTC-related activities and then this activity, a man who has now admitted he was desperate and willing to do anything for money, that when presented with a similar situation in the future, that he would make those same decisions.

The guidelines here in this case, your Honor, in some respects, I think, understate the seriousness of this offense. The defendant's comments to the confidential source, as I said earlier, reflect an intention to engage in a larger amount of money laundering than just the \$200,000 that were transmitted to Panama. They also reflect a level of communication with at least Tirso Dominguez, if not William Cristo-Fares, that suggests he was aware of the full scope and intention of the discussions that all the defendants were having with the

confidential source. That full scope of that conspiracy, even if it doesn't count for sophistication as a guidelines enhancement, certainly had indicia of sophistication.

These are all things, your Honor, I submit, would warrant potentially a sentence above the guidelines. As I've also conceded today, there are some factors that are brought to the Court's attention, and in particular the things that he's done since he was arrested in this case, that I think are mitigating. On balance, given the seriousness of this offense, given his criminal history, the risk of recidivism, I submit that a guidelines sentence is appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bove.

Counsel, Mr. Bove suggested you may want to say something in response to his comments. If you'd like to do so, I'll give you that opportunity.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thank you. Just a couple of things, please, if I may. Regarding the continued verbal telephone conversations in the intervening crime to arrest period — again this is proffer, Judge, and I ask the Court to accept — Mr. McCabe was directed to keep that going. He did not further crime or act upon it. He was told to keep these people happy from the codefendant.

Issue with the gun, Mr. McCabe would say that he did not make the statement about keeping the gun for protection, for necessity, in any meaning or furtherance of crimes in this

case. I think the PSR also speaks to that.

The government talks about the Colorado arrest, which in the PSR is on page 9, and that is 1989 when the defendant was at Gunnison College in Colorado. So that's February.

That's 27 years ago. And defendant's memory of that is a conviction for false reporting to authorities. But to put that in context, I think that that occurred while he was a college student. As the PSR mentions, I don't know if it was Gunnison State, Colorado State, but the school was in Gunnison, Colorado, and that happened during his school years.

Then, finally, on this civil judgment, I would point out — and I briefly discussed this as well with the government before coming into court, Judge. They address in their discussion section this federal regulatory action, and I think factually some of the things are incorrect about that beginning on page 8, which is their third point: Third, the circumstances giving rise to a federal regulatory action related to the defendant's 2012 arrest in Florida, which he failed to disclose to the probation office in his sentencing submission, reflect a heightened recidivism.

Next paragraph: In August 2012, McCabe was arrested and subsequently convicted of two state law felony counts. I think that's a misprint, because if you look at the PSR, August 2012, page 9, paragraph 44, he got convicted of misdemeanors. So Mr. McCabe stands before the Court having

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

only been a convicted felon one time, and that is upon Court's acceptance of this plea. Those harassing phone calls out of Broward County, which is Fort Lauderdale, Florida, were misdemeanor harassing phone calls which gave him six months' probation each, page 9, 44. So that's one as to the agency.

Then, finally, which I think the government is not confident in the argument I'm about to say to you, and that is, in that regulatory action, he was represented by an attorney named Fred Schwartz who the Court knows maybe from the beginning of this case was an attorney for Halim Fares. After some recordings were given by the government and Mr. Fares was seen with an attorney card of Mr. Schwartz as a Florida -- I'm not sure if he said associate, but a business card that Halim had relative to Fred Schwartz, Fred Schwartz was Mr. McCabe's attorney for that civil matter that the government discussed. I would proffer that before the civil matter was filed or instigated by the agency, Mr. McCabe went into Mr. Schwartz's office, advised him of that civil matter, not criminal. The word "criminal" never came up. Noncriminal in nature. civil lawsuit. Presented Mr. McCabe with a document to sign to get it over with. Mr. McCabe signed it and moved on. And Mr. McCabe did not think, not only pursuant to Mr. Schwartz's advice at the time, but when he moved forward over the years and the three companies, for credit purposes or any other financial purposes, that judgment never came up. Other things

did that are reflected in the PSR. But that specific judgment that he signed with attorney Fred Schwartz, he remembers signing it, he remembers it resolving when he walked out of the office, and the final words were: You're good, Sean. They can't collect from you. And in Mr. McCabe's mind, it was done and then confirmed done over the years as nothing about it came up.

Those are the additional comments. Thank you, Court.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Is there any reason why sentence should not be imposed at this time, Mr. Bove?

MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Gershman?

MR. GERSHMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I will now describe the sentence that I intend to impose. Counsel will have a final opportunity to make legal objections before the sentence is finally imposed.

As I've stated, the guideline range applicable to this case is 46 to 57 months' imprisonment. I've considered the guidelines range. Under the Supreme Court's decision in *Booker* and its progeny, the guidelines range is only one factor that I must consider in deciding the appropriate sentence. I'm also required to consider the other factors set forth in 18 U.S.C.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section 3553(a). These include, first, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; second, the need for the sentence imposed to (a) reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense; (b) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; (c) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and (d) to provide the defendant with needed vocational or educational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner; third, the kinds of sentences available; fourth, the guidelines range; fifth, any pertinent policy statements; sixth, the need to avoid any unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found quilty of similar conduct; and, seventh, the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

Ultimately, I'm required to impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes of sentencing that I mentioned a moment ago set forth in the statute at 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a).

I've given substantial thought and attention to the appropriate sentence in this case. I've reviewed all of the submissions that the parties provided to me. And I've considered all of the Section 3553(a) factors and the purposes of sentencing as reflected in the statute. Now, based on my

review of all of the factors, which I intend to discuss in more detail in a moment, I intend to impose a non-guidelines sentence of 25 months' incarceration to be followed by three years of supervised release, subject to the mandatory and special conditions described in the presentence report which I will detail with more specificity later. I do not expect to impose a fine. I expect to be ordering forfeiture. I will also impose a mandatory fee of \$100.

Now, the nature of the crime here is very serious. The defendant conspired to launder funds that he considered to be drug proceeds. The amount of money laundered, I think in this instance, was relatively modest on the grand scheme of things; but I do not understate the amount that money laundering contributes to drug trafficking generally in this country. It is a very serious offense, and it fuels other criminal activity.

I spent a lot of time with the materials that were submitted to me about you, Mr. McCabe, and I'd like to review some of those materials now. Mr. McCabe was born in Stanford, California, in 1970. Your parents, both lawyers, separated when Mr. McCabe was seven and, tragically, as we heard again today, his father passed away when Mr. McCabe was only 13. Although Mr. McCabe is the child of a judge who does not want to play the judge card, he was exposed at a young age to drugs and struggled with drug addiction as a teenager. Ultimately,

Mr. McCabe was sent to attend two boarding schools, and I understand was able to successfully conquer his addiction to drugs, a fact that he refers to in his letter to me today.

Mr. McCabe attended Western State Colorado University from August 1988 until May 1993. He left in good academic standing to pursue a business venture. Despite the fact that he did not receive a college degree, Mr. McCabe is clearly a very smart man, with many interests and talents: A skier, a dirt biker, guitarist, SCUBA diver, helicopter pilot, and rescue worker. His work history is varied. He has owned and managed adult entertainment establishments in Florida. He's worked as a professional poker player, an import/export consultant, a sales executive in a precious metals company, and owned an interest in an ill-fated gold mine in Colombia, which by the way, Mr. Gershman, is with an "O" when you're referring to the university.

Mr. McCabe is a skilled entrepreneurial polymath, but unfortunately not all of his ventures have gone well. He's already crossed the line in one of his business ventures which resulted in a criminal conviction that I detailed earlier and, as I understand it, federal regulatory action.

Mr. McCabe has not been married but has a number of strong relationships. Among them, his friendships with the Raff family, both his ex-fiancee, who's here today, and her parents, who submitted very kind letters on his behalf.

Mr. Raff has offered Mr. McCabe a place to live in Florida upon his release. And the level of support from those friends and the regard for his personal qualities weigh favorably as I evaluate Mr. McCabe's sentence for this offense, very much so.

I understand that Mr. McCabe's role in this offense was relatively minor, putting aside his comments in the window after he delivered the cash. He was contacted by Mr. Dominguez who acted as at intermediary between him and Mr. Cristo-Fares. Mr. McCabe did not negotiate or organize the money laundering exercises. As I understand it, he was the pointed end of the spear who functioned essentially as a mule to carry the funds from the United States abroad. He did so according to instructions, in a way that I've described in the prior sentencing as very simply by carrying cash in his bag.

While the United States points me to comments that Mr. McCabe made during the transaction suggesting a willingness to conduct other more extensive crimes, I have no evidence that he committed any crime during the period after he transported the funds at issue in this case and the date of his arrest.

I also take into account the defendant's assertions regarding his severe economic situation that he faced at the time that he chose to undertake this criminal act. A desire for financial gain never justifies crime. I appreciate defendant's argument that he was approached regarding this criminal, I'll call it, opportunity at a time when he was

confronted with a pressing specific financial need to acquire equipment to allow his gold mine venture to get off the ground. I understand that the car that Mr. McCabe was in around the time of his arrest contained an unloaded gun, but I have no evidence that suggests that Mr. McCabe possessed that weapon illegally or that he was involved in any kind of violence in connection with this crime or any other.

I believe that a meaningful sentence is important in this case to impose a just punishment. I'm required to consider the deterrent effect both on Mr. McCabe personally and to deter others from committing this crime. With respect to personal deterrence, which I agree with Mr. Bove is a significant issue here, significant because Mr. McCabe, frankly, was old enough at the time of this offense to know not to do what he did; concerning because of his prior criminal conviction. At the same time, I'll be imposing a substantial term of supervised release in addition to what I think is meaningful jail time, which I hope will be sufficient to prevent Mr. McCabe from committing further criminal acts.

I must also consider the role of general deterrence, and a meaningful sentence is important to dissuade others from offering to launder drug proceeds. That factor I weigh against the other factors, including the ones that I've just articulated and will proceed to describe in more detail momentarily.

I've considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. In this case I am imposing a shorter, much shorter, period of incarceration on Mr. McCabe than his codefendant Mr. Cristo-Fares. I do that in recognition of the fact that Mr. McCabe's role in this offense is more limited than that of Mr. Cristo-Fares. Essentially, as I said earlier, he acted as a mule for this cash in a transaction coordinated and negotiated by Mr. Cristo-Fares who, unlike Mr. McCabe, was a practicing attorney without great financial need to motivate his offense. While Mr. McCabe's term of incarceration is shorter than that of Mr. Cristo-Fares, as Mr. Gershman notes, Mr. McCabe will also be subject to a substantial period of supervised release.

I also take into account the positive acts that Mr. McCabe has undertaken as a prisoner at the MCC and MDC. Mr. Bove asked me to consider that in light of your motivation to present yourself as a person who's rehabilitated himself in connection with this sentencing. That's true of everyone that appears in front of me. You've done more, and I appreciate that, and I think that that's a fact that has to weigh in your favor as I consider the sentencing here. I note your letter to me refers to the philosophy of the Dalai Lama, and the quote from you says that you should do whatever you can to help people in their lives. I appreciate that you've done what you did to help your fellow prisoners, and I hope that you'll

continue to do that in the future.

To be clear, you're not helping anybody if you're engaged in criminal acts to do so, and that is not a justification to engage in criminal acts. So to the extent that you view in any part this philosophy as justifying criminal behavior, I do not agree. But I agree with the philosophy that it's good to help if you can, and I hope that you'll do that and you'll take advantage of this time to do so.

I believe that the proposed sentence reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, and provides just punishment under the circumstances. I've considered Mr. McCabe's ability to use the period of incarceration for educational and vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment. I appreciate that Mr. McCabe has taken advantage of the existing programming in prison and, more importantly, as I described earlier, I appreciate the affirmative steps that he's taken to educate other prisoners. Those efforts deserve recognition and affirmation.

I've considered the kinds of sentences available in this case. While I believe that a sentence with a meaningful term of incarceration is necessary given the nature of the offense and Mr. McCabe's involvement in it, I believe that the blend of time in prison and supervised release is appropriate here.

I've given serious consideration to the guidelines and the policy statements in this case. I believe that a non-guidelines sentence is appropriate. I think that a longer period of incarceration is not necessary in this case, given the nature of Mr. McCabe's role in the offense principally but also given Mr. McCabe's abilities. I hope that he will take this opportunity to make productive use of his skills outside of prison.

Mr. McCabe, would you please rise for imposition of sentence. It is the judgment of this Court, Mr. McCabe, that you be sentenced to 25 months of incarceration. I find that sentence to be sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a)(2).

Following your term of imprisonment, I am sentencing you to a term of three years of supervised release, which is within the guideline range. The mandatory conditions of supervised release shall apply. They are the defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. The defendant shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. The defendant shall not possess a firearm or destructive device. The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended due to the imposition of a special condition requiring drug treatment and testing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The standard conditions of supervised release 1 In addition, the following special through 13 shall apply. conditions shall apply: The defendant shall submit his person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any property, computer (as defined in 18 U.S.C. Section 1030 Exhibit 1), electronic communications, data storage devices, and/or other media under his control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of the release may be found. The search must be conducted in a reasonable time and in a reasonable matter. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation. The defendant shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

The defendant will participate in an outpatient treatment program approved by the United States Probation Office which program may include testing to determine whether the defendant has reverted to using drugs and alcohol. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of services rendered based on the defendant's ability to pay and the availability of third party payments. The Court authorizes the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports, including the presentence report investigation report, to the substance abuse treatment provider.

The defendant shall be supervised in his district of

1 residence. The defendant is to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of release from custody. 2 3 Mr. McCabe, there will be no fine because the 4 probation office reports that you are unable to pay one. 5 defendant must pay to the United States a total special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately. 6 7 Mr. Bove, I understand that the United States is seeking forfeiture of \$40,000; is that correct? 8 9 MR. BOVE: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And you've submitted a form of forfeiture 11 order. 12 Mr. Gershman, do you have any objections to the form 13 of forfeiture order presented by the United States in this 14 matter? 15 MR. GERSHMAN: Defense does not. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 I'm going to order that the defendant forfeit a sum of \$40,000 in U.S. currency. I'm going to enter a written order 18 19 containing the substance of this order at this time or 20 immediately following this proceeding. 21 Mr. Bove, I understand the government's not seeking 22 restitution; is that correct? 23 Yes, Judge. MR. BOVE:

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why

Thank you.

24

25

THE COURT:

```
sentence shall not be imposes as stated?
1
 2
               MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.
 3
               MR. GERSHMAN: Not from defense, Judge.
 4
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 5
               The sentence as stated is imposed. I find that
6
      sentence to be sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to
 7
      comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C.
      Section 3553(a)(2).
8
9
               You can be seated, Mr. McCabe. Thank you very much.
10
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Thank you very much, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. McCabe, you have the right to appeal
12
      your conviction and sentence except to whatever extent you may
13
      have already waived that right as part of your plea agreement.
14
      The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the
15
      judgment of conviction. If you're not able to pay the costs of
16
      an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis.
17
      If you request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a
18
      notice of appeal on your behalf.
19
               Are there any other applications at this time,
20
     Mr. Bove?
21
               MR. BOVE: No, Judge.
22
               THE COURT: Mr. Gershman?
23
               MR. GERSHMAN: No.
                                   Thank you, Judge.
24
               THE COURT: Thank you.
25
               Let me just take a couple of minutes before we
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

adjourn. Mr. McCabe, as you can see, I've read through all the materials that were submitted to me very carefully. I think that you're a man with great capacity. That comes through in the materials that are submitted to me. That's part of what makes this situation so unfortunate. I hope that you've learned a lesson from this event.

Let me just highlight some things for you. You know you can be caught. You know from this that anybody you talk to could be a government agent. You are now a convicted felon, which I expect would weigh against you if you were ever caught or convicted of another crime and sentenced for it. lawyer will advise you on this, but as you just heard, one of the conditions of the terms of your supervised release is that you not commit any other crime. If you commit another crime, that, in addition to the underlying substantive offense, could be viewed as a violation of the terms of your supervised release which, as your will attorney will advise you, would or could result in you being in front of me again for sentencing in connection with the violation of the terms of your supervised release in addition to whatever other sentence is imposed for that other offense.

Again, I think that you are a smart man. With those factors in mind, I'm very much expecting that as you weigh decisions that are put in front of you going forward, you are going to choose to avoid further criminal acts. Put simply,

the risk of you being caught again is much higher, and the risk of a significant, even more significant, penalty has dramatically been increased as a result of your conviction and sentence here. So as you run the numbers and evaluate the risk and reward of crime, as you've done successfully as a poker player, I hope that you'll take those factors into account and that will lead you to do the right thing, which is to help yourself and your friends and loved ones but not to allow that desire to help other people lead you to do something like this. I hope you don't, because if you do, I'll see you back here again.

With that, let me thank former Ms. Raff for being here. I appreciate your support, your parents' support for Mr. McCabe. Their support for him and providing him a place to be after he's released was a very important factor for me in considering the appropriate sentence for him and in the hope that he'll be able to find a clear path forward after he's released from this time of incarceration. I hope that you and your family members will continue to support him after his release. So thank you very much for doing that.

This proceeding is adjourned. Thank you very much. (Adjourned)